

SP



**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**United States Patent and Trademark Office**  
**Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS**  
**P.O. Box 1450**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450**  
**www.uspto.gov**

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,386	08/18/2003	Paul C. Wacker	H0005399 US	3629
128	7590	01/19/2005		
<b>HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.</b> 101 COLUMBIA ROAD P O BOX 2245 MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245			<b>EXAMINER</b>	
			NORMAN, MARC E	
			<b>ART UNIT</b>	<b>PAPER NUMBER</b>
			3744	

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/643,386	WACKER ET AL. <i>[Handwritten signature]</i>	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Marc E. Norman	3744	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 35 and 57-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 35 and 57-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 January 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
      1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

The previous Office Action was made Final. Subsequently, Applicant amended the claims to include the subject matter indicated as allowable. However, upon further search, the Examiner has found new art that renders the claimed subject matter unpatentable. Accordingly, a new Office Action is set forth below. Since the new rejections were not necessitated by Applicant's amendments, this Office Action is made NON-FINAL, and prosecution of the case is hereby reopened. The Examiner apologizes for any inconvenience due to the fact that these rejections were not applied in the previous Office Action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 35, 57, 59, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kline et al. in view of Alles.

As per claims 57, 59, and 61, Kline et al. teaches all aspects of these claims (as discussed in the previous Office Action with regards to claims 29-33 and 51-53) except the portable configuring apparatus being connectable via infrared connection to each of the air management systems. Alles teaches a PDA directly connected to an air management system via infrared connection (see paragraph [0067], lines 8-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply such infrared-based communication of Alles to the system of Kline et al. (foregoing the intermediate global communication structure), for the purpose of the convenience of applying the PDA control directly the air management system.

As per claim 35, official notice is taken that display screens are common and integral features of PDAs.

Claims 58 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kline et al. in view of Mehaffey et al.

As per claims 58 and 60, Kline et al. teaches all aspects of these claims (as discussed in the previous Office Action with regards to claims 29 and 55) except transferring configurations from one air management system to another. Mehaffey et al. teaches to concept of transferring information among different air management controllers (see column 4, lines 46-49). Since, as discussed regarding claims 29 and 55, Kline et al. teaches the capabilities of uploading and downloading information to each of the systems, it is simple step to combine the concept of transferring information among different air management controllers as taught by Mehaffey et al.

Art Unit: 3744

to the system of Kline et al. for the purpose of integrating the systems to provide greater overall efficiency.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc E. Norman whose telephone number is 571-272-4812. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Denise Esquivel can be reached on 571-272-4808. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MN



**MARC NORMAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**